Cypress Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cypress Elementary School

10055 SWEET BAY CT, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://ces.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jeanne Krapfl

Start Date for this Principal: 5/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Cypress Elementary School

10055 SWEET BAY CT, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://ces.pasco.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

All our students achieve success in college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cypress Elementary School is a learning community dedicated to developing resilient, lifelong learners who will work towards reaching their highest potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Berryhill, Tammy	Principal	
Tonello, Erika	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Erika Tonello
		Nancy Bevan, Kindergarten Teacher

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	100	124	87	108	130	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	689
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	17	17	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	3	5	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	27	27	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	14	7	26	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
42

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	58%	57%	56%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	59%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	54%	53%	50%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	60%	63%	56%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	61%	62%	61%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	51%	65%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	53%	53%	45%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	100 (0)	124 (0)	87 (0)	108 (0)	130 (0)	140 (0)	689 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	15 ()	17 ()	17 ()	18 ()	21 ()	88 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	3 ()	5 ()	5 ()	6 ()	11 ()	30 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	4 ()	27 ()	27 ()	14 ()	22 ()	94 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	35 ()	22 ()	36 ()	93 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	60%	-5%	58%	-3%
	2018	58%	57%	1%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	59%	4%	58%	5%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	59%	-6%	62%	-9%
	2018	68%	59%	9%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	62%	0%	64%	-2%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
	2018	45%	58%	-13%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	54	55	25	49	41	21				
HSP	71	80	70	58	60	55	58				
MUL	57			50							
WHT	55	53	53	54	51	35	47				
FRL	50	56	57	45	50	41	42				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	22	14	25	32	19	17				
ASN	69			85							
HSP	50	33		49	35						
MUL	67	54		53	54						
WHT	54	45	17	58	43	22	53				
FRL	45	37	16	47	34	21	40				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	30	36	35	32	58	76	52				
ELL	62			62							
ASN	92			100							
HSP	47	50		47	43		38				
MUL	69			75							
WHT	56	59	50	55	61	65	45				
FRL	51	59	53	48	59	58	38				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math lowest 25th percent shows the lowest performance, 38% of the math lowest 25th percentile made learning gains. However, this was a 14% increase from the previous year. We had monthly meetings to discuss and monitor the data of the lowest quartile students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Math Achievement had the greatest decline of all data from last year. We had some behavior students in 3rd grade that contributed the disturbance of the learning environment causing a 15% drop in 3rd grade math proficiency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math lowest 25th percentile had the greatest gap between state, 51% and school, 38%. Need to tighten the monitoring of the lowest quartile students and move the focus move towards an acceleration model.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The FSA data that showed the most improvement was the ELA Lowest 25th %, the jump was from 17% to 54%. New actions taken were monthly meetings to discuss and monitor the data of the lowest quartile students. The most important action was a strong narrow focus on writing.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

After analyzing our data from the EWS, we need to tighten up our monitoring of our instruction throughout the lesson so that we do not have the amount of students with course failures. We will be proactive with this area during our PLC work around the 4 guiding questions and then monitor our work.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Writing, continue our narrow focus on writing across all content areas.
2. Engagement - Continue to tighten student engagement and work towards student owned accountability.
3. Data - Monitor and use our data to make decisions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	High Impact Instruction
Rationale	Teachers will plan, deliver, assess and monitor standards-based instruction matched to the rigor of the standards in all content areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA Reading, Math and Science increases of 10% more proficient students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Berryhill (tberryhi@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Within PLCs and PST, teams will collaborate to design, implement, and monitor essential learning standards, common formative assessments, facilitation grids, exit tickets and writing rubrics. Lessons in ALL content areas will require students to produce textual evidence and explain their learning in writing. Teachers will work with support staff to build a multi-tiered system of support/instruction to ensure that 80% of students will show more than a year of growth in reading as evidenced through IRLA, Comprehension Checks, CFAs, Quarterly Assessments, and FSA Teachers will cognitively engage students,, with students being the center of learning, in the classroom through accountable talk and collaborative tasks (Kagan Cooperative learning).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Proved equal opportunity for all students to learn the grade level standards. Meeting agendas and minutes.

Action Step	
Description	1. Professional Learning Communities 2. Common Formative Assessments 3. Data Based Professional Development
Person Responsible	Tammy Berryhill (tberryhi@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Collaborative Culture
Rationale	In order to strengthen our collaborative culture, Cypress staff will work together to develop a stronger collective responsibility of all staff.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA Reading, Math and Science Data - 10% increase in proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Berryhill (tberryhi@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Revisit and strengthen our school-wide expectations. Continue to develop the role of our CUBS Leadership team. Celebrate Staff and Student accomplishments throughout the school year. Establish consistent communication of feedback to teachers. Students actively engaged and are owners of their learning. Students develop a positive self-talk through a growth mindset Staff will focused on school-wide executive functioning skills to support students. Students will set academic goals, monitor, and accomplish those goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Team work will create buy in for the way of our work. Meeting agendas and minutes.
Action Step	
Description	1. Collective responsibilities for staff. 2. Student goal setting.
Person Responsible	Tammy Berryhill (tberryhi@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Data Driven Instruction
Rationale	Build a multi-tiered system of support for students to ensure 75% or more of students achieve growth in all content areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA Reading, Math and Science increase of 10% more proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Berryhill (tberryhi@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teams will take collective responsibility to develop intervention based on the grade level essential standards and plan to ensure growth for all students.

Teachers will use data to adapt instruction to flexibly meet students' needs.

Progress of interventions will be monitored, graphed, and organized in the team data binder to determine reteaching opportunities for mastery of standards.

Teachers create and plan interventions tied to essential standards.

PLCs will work collaboratively, using grade level data to plan for tier 2 and tier 3 and enrichment. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | MTSS will be used as a framework for our work. Meeting agendas and minutes. |

Action Step	
Description	1. Develop collective responsibility 2. Monitor lowest quartile students 3. Plan for intervention and enrichment
Person Responsible	Tammy Berryhill (tberryhi@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We will continue our focus of writing, student engagement and data. Our area of focus in the area learning gains for math lowest quartile.